

# Executive Summary

---

## ES.1 Introduction

This joint draft environmental assessment/environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (DEA/DEIR/DEIS) is a public document that assesses the environmental effects of the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project (proposed action), as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and in compliance with the Council on Environmental Quality Guidelines (*40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500 to 1508*), State CEQA Guidelines (*14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 14000 et seq.*), and the U.S. Department of Transportation's Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (*23 CFR 771*).

Because the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) could release federal funding for the proposed action and is responsible for approving or denying actions associated with the interstate highway system, compliance with NEPA is required; FHWA is therefore the federal lead agency under NEPA, with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) acting as liaison and providing oversight for the NEPA process. FHWA and Caltrans are overseeing the preparation of an EA under NEPA for the proposed action because it has been determined that the whole of the proposed action may result in an adverse effect on the quality of the human environment.

Placer County, the lead agency under CEQA, must evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed action when considering whether to approve the project. Placer County has determined that the appropriate level of CEQA environmental documentation is an EIR because the proposed action may have a substantial effect on the environment.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is the lead agency responsible for certification of the document pursuant to its regional plan, and it is an EIS under TRPA requirements.

The organization of this DEA/DEIR/DEIS has been prepared to follow a format agreed upon by FHWA, Caltrans, and TRPA based on the Caltrans standard environmental reference annotated outline. For the purpose of the impact discussions in this document, significance conclusions are provided in the context of CEQA and are presented in *Chapter 5*. In addition, Table ES-2, located at the end of this chapter, presents a brief summary of the impacts of the build alternatives under consideration.

The intent of the preparers of this joint document is to provide the readers with a clear description of the environmental analysis conducted for this proposed action within the framework of applicable regulations. This DEA/DEIR/DEIS serves as an informational document to be used in the local planning and decision-making process and does not recommend approval or denial of the proposed action. After the public circulation period, all substantive comments on environmental issues will be responded to in a final environmental assessment/environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EA/EIR/EIS) and distributed to the public and agencies for consideration. After the final EA/EIR/EIS is prepared, FHWA and Placer County will make the final determination of the proposed action's effect on the environment.

This document is organized in the following chapters:

- The *Executive Summary* provides a brief description of the proposed action and actions in the same geographic area, the alternatives considered, areas of known controversy, major environmental impacts, unresolved issues, benefits of the project, and other authorizations and approvals that may be required.
- *Chapter 1, Proposed Project*, presents an overview of the proposed action and a description of the project location, purpose and need, and background.
- *Chapter 2, Alternatives*, presents a description of the alternative development process, including alternatives that were considered and withdrawn and the alternatives that are evaluated in this joint document.

- *Chapter 3, Affected Environment*, constitutes the NEPA and TRPA evaluation for the proposed action. It covers the following environmental resources and issues. The following resources and issues are discussed in *Sections 3.1 to 3.16* of this chapter.
  - Air Quality
  - Cultural Resources
  - Social Environment
  - Hydrology and Flood Plains
  - Hazardous Waste/Material
  - Traffic
  - Parking
  - Land Use and Planning
  - Noise
  - Recreation
  - Public Services and Utilities
  - Geology and Soils
  - Water Quality
  - Growth Inducing Impacts
  - Visual Resources
  - Biological Resources

Each section above discusses the affected environment for the resource topic (which also serves as the setting section for *Chapter 5*), environmental consequences associated with the proposed action and no-action alternative, and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the environmental consequences.

- *Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts*, describes the impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the proposed action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.
- *Chapter 5, CEQA Impacts/Mandatory Findings of Significance*, presents the CEQA evaluation for this project. It presents the significance thresholds used to judge impacts under CEQA, and the pre- and post-mitigation CEQA significance conclusions associated with each impact.
- *Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Consultation*, describes the scoping process, includes the dates of the NOI and NOP, lists the agencies that were consulted in order to prepare this document, and lists the agencies that are receiving a copy of this document.
- *Chapter 7, List of Preparers*, lists the technical specialists who prepared or reviewed this joint document.
- *Chapter 8, References*, includes reference information for all sources and personal communications that were cited in preparation of this joint document.
- *Chapter 9, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*, which ensures the mitigation measures will be implemented.

## **ES.2 Project Background**

Historically, Kings Beach, California, has been one of the primary commercial and recreational centers in the Lake Tahoe Basin. State Route (SR) 28 extends through the Kings Beach commercial area, which is generally defined as extending from the SR 267 intersection at the western boundary to the intersection of SR 28 and Chipmunk Street at the eastern boundary. Land uses are predominantly tourist/recreational and commercial.

Over the years, land use development in Kings Beach has been influenced by the nature of its original subdivision. The 1926 “Brockway Vista” subdivision map laid out rectangular lots in a typical grid system. Many of the lots are small, measuring

7.6 meters (24.9 feet) in width and 38.1 meters (125.0 feet) in depth. This layout has resulted in a large number of small structures confined by parcel width.

Originally constructed as a two-lane Forest Reserve road in the early 1930s, SR 28 cuts somewhat diagonally through the subdivision. Parcels in blocks adjacent to the highway are located perpendicular to the road and slightly askew from parcels and blocks in the remainder of the community. At the time, the limited width of SR 28 allowed for roadside parking and an adequate setback between the roadway and adjacent buildings. During the 1960s, the roadway was expanded to four lanes through the commercial core area. The additional lanes were provided at the expense of the setback between buildings and the road. Roadside parking was also affected. During peak summer periods, there is a shortage of available parking in portions of the commercial core area. In addition, pedestrian crossing of the highway was made more difficult due to the roadway widening.

Placer County and TRPA adopted the *Kings Beach Community Plan* (KBCP) in 1996. That plan presents a vision intended to guide community enhancement activities. Major components of the KBCP are directed at the commercial core. These include reconstructing SR 28, providing improved pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, installing streetscape improvements, and constructing water quality improvements.

Other projects occurring concurrently within the Kings Beach area are identified in *Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts*.

### **ES.3 Purpose and Need**

The intent of the proposed action is to address bicycle and pedestrian circulation, preservation of scenery, and water quality needs within the Kings Beach Commercial Core area in a manner consistent with the KBCP.

The proposed action will meet needs identified in the Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Improvement Program. The objective of the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP)

is to achieve the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity, which are standards required by Public Law 96-551 (Tahoe Regional Planning Compact) and adopted for the Tahoe Region in 1982 by the TRPA. The following EIP projects are addressed by the proposed action and this environmental document:

**Table ES-1.** TRPA Environmental Improvement Plan Projects

EIP Number	Project Category	Project Title/Description
<b>Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project</b>		
787	Air Quality/Transportation	Kings Beach roadway curb/gutter sidewalk bicycle trail and water quality improvements
10060	Water Quality	Kings Beach Commercial Core
<b>Kings Beach Watershed Improvement Project</b>		
15	Water Quality	Kings Beach residential area treatment, Phase II
733	Water Quality	Kings Beach industrial

## ES.4 Project Elements

The proposed action is located in the community of Kings Beach, which is situated along the north shore of Lake Tahoe in Placer County, California. The action area contains both residential and commercial properties and receives high vehicular and pedestrian traffic year-round.

As currently proposed, elements of the proposed action include roadway improvements to SR 28 to accommodate anticipated future transit and pedestrian needs; the installation of sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and storm drain facilities at specific locations; drainage ditch lining and revegetation at specific locations; streetscaping; the designation of specific road sites as on-street parking; and the construction of new, off-street parking lots at specific locations within the action area.

## ES.5 Alternatives Considered

As part of the proposed action, four alternatives are evaluated in the DEA/DEIR/DEIS for the proposed improvements to SR 28 through the action area.

- **Alternative 1: No Build.** The existing roadway configuration would be unchanged.
- **Alternative 2.** Consists of three-lane cross-section and no on-street parking during the summer peak season on either side of SR 28, with roundabouts at Bear Street and Coon Street. A bicycle lane roughly 1.5 meters (4.9 feet) in width and a 2.9-meter (9-foot) sidewalk and landscaped planting area would be provided in both directions. Alternative 2 would also have the option of reducing the sidewalk width on both sides by 0.6 meter (2 feet) to reduce the effect of the on-street parking on through traffic. This 0.6 meter (2 feet) would be added to the parking and bike lane width throughout the action area.
- **Alternative 3.** Consists of four-lane cross-section and on-street parking along both sides of SR 28, with traffic signals at SR 267, Bear Street, and Coon Street. Left turn lanes would be provided on SR 28 at SR 267, Bear Street, Fox Street, Coon Street, and Chipmunk Street. A 1.5-meter (4.9-foot) bicycle lane and a sidewalk with a minimum 1.7-meter (5.6-foot) width would be provided in both directions.
- **Alternative 4.** Identical to Alternative 2, except that on-street parking would be prohibited over the entire year (including winter). In addition, the sidewalk and planting areas in each direction would be wider than Alternative 2.

Under all alternatives (except Alternative 1), Brook Avenue from Bear Street to Coon Street would be converted to one-way eastbound, providing the opportunity for additional on-street parking. Alternative 3 is the only alternative that has a nonstandard design feature, utilizing 3.3 meters (11 feet) lanes. All other alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 4) do not have any nonstandard design features.

To mitigate the loss of parking associated with various alternatives, it will be necessary to replace parking spaces lost by the proposed road improvements in a manner that addresses the parking requirements of each block affected in order to ensure that adequate parking conditions are maintained. However, no property acquisitions (including demolitions or relocations) would be associated with any of the new parking spaces.

## **ES.6 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

*Sections 3.1 to 3.16* of this document analyze the potential impacts of the proposed action for each of the resource subjects required by NEPA. Growth inducing and cumulative impacts are analyzed in *Chapter 4*. *Chapter 5* outlines the impacts of the proposed action for each of the resource areas required by CEQA. A summary of these impacts appears in Table ES-2.

## **ES.7 Consistency with Environmental Laws, Regulations, and Policies**

Placer County distributed a notice of preparation (NOP) of a DEA/DEIR/DEIS for the proposed action on November 30, 2002 (Appendix A), and the comment period that ended on December 23, 2002. A public notice was printed in four local newspapers, including the *Sierra Sun* from November 21 to 27, 2002; the *North Lake Tahoe Bonanza* on November 22, 2002; the *Tahoe World* on November 21, 2002; and the *Tahoe Daily Tribune* from November 22 to 24, 2002. In addition, 51 letters were sent to interested individuals, agencies, and groups. Placer County held an agency and public scoping meeting on the proposed action on December 5, 2002. The scoping meeting was an opportunity for agencies and the public to obtain information about the proposed action and to provide input regarding the issues they wanted addressed in the DEA/DEIR/DEIS. Comments about the NOP were considered in the preparation of the EA/EIR/EIS.



**Table ES-2.** Summary of Environmental Impacts—Proposed Action

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation <sup>a</sup>	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact AIR-1: Generation of Construction-Related Emissions of Ozone Precursors (Reactive Organic Gases and Oxides of Nitrogen), Carbon Monoxide, and Particulate Matter in Excess of Placer County Air Pollution Control District Standards	LS	Mitigation Measure AIR-1: Implement All Applicable PCAPCD Best-Available Mitigation Measures.  Mitigation Measure AIR-2: Implement all applicable TRPA Best Management Practices  Mitigation Measure AIR-3: Implement Caltrans Standard Specification 7-1.01F and Standard Specification 10.	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact AIR-2: Generation of Operation-Related Emissions of Ozone Precursors (Reactive Organic Gases and Oxides of Nitrogen), Carbon Monoxide, and Particulate Matter in Excess of Placer County Air Pollution Control District Standards	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact AIR-3: Generation of Carbon Monoxide Hotspot Emissions in Excess of the Federal or State Standards	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact AIR-4: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Elevated Levels of Diesel Exhaust and an Increased Health Risk	S	Mitigation Measure AIR-4: Implement Construction Emissions Control Technology.	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact AIR-5: Atmospheric Deposition of Phosphorus from Re-Entrained Roadway Fugitive Dust into Lake Tahoe	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact AIR-6: Generation of Significant Levels of Odors	LS	NA	NA

**NOTES:**

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

LS = less than significant	SU = significant and unavoidable	B = Beneficial
PS = potentially significant	NI = no impact	C = Cumulative
S = significant	NA = not applicable	

Table ES-2. Continued

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation <sup>a</sup>	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact CR-1. Potential Disturbance to Unidentified Archaeological Resources during Construction	S	Mitigation Measure CR-1: Stop Work if Buried Resources Are Discovered Inadvertently	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact CR-2. Inadvertent Discovery of Native American Human Remains	S	Mitigation Measure CR-2: Comply with State and Federal Laws Relating to Native American Remains	LS
3	Impact CR-3. Destruction or Disturbance to a Significant Architectural Resource—Felte Building	LS	NA	NA
<b>SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact SOC-1: Displacement of a Substantial Number of People or Housing Units	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact SOC-2: Impacts on Community Cohesion	LS	NA	NA
2,3,4	Impact SOC-4: Loss of Property Tax Revenue	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact SOC-5: Revenue Effects on Local and Roadside Businesses	LS	NA	NA
2,3,4	Impact SOC-6: Construction-Related Economic Impacts	S	Mitigation Measure LU-2: Provide Additional Parking for Alternative 2  Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan during Construction	LS
<b>HYDROLOGY AND FLOOD PLAINS</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact HYD-1. Substantial Alteration in the Quantity of Surface Runoff	LS	NA	LS

## NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

LS = less than significant	SU = significant and unavoidable	B = Beneficial
PS = potentially significant	NI = no impact	C = Cumulative
S = significant	NA = not applicable	

Table ES-2. Continued

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation <sup>a</sup>	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4	Impact HYD-2. Placement of Structures that Would Impede or Redirect Flood-Flows within a 100-Year Floodplain	LS	NA	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact HYD-3. Exposure of People, Structures, or Facilities to Significant Risk from Flooding, Including Flooding as a Result of the Failure of a Levee or Dam	B	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact HYD-4. Creation of or Contribution to Runoff that Would Exceed the Capacity of an Existing or Planned Stormwater Management System	LS	NA	LS
<b>HAZARDOUS WASTE/MATERIAL</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact HAZ-1: Potential Hazard to the Public or the Environment Through the Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials	NI	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact HAZ-2: Potential Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials Into the Environment	S	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. Incorporate Measures to Reduce Potential for Accidental Release or Exposure to Hazardous Materials	LS
1, 2, 3, 4	Impact HAZ-3: Potential Exposure of School Children to Hazardous Materials	NI	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact HAZ-4: Potential Exposure of the Public to Contaminated Soils	S	Mitigation Measure HAZ-2. Implement Measures to Reduce Potential Exposure to Contaminated Soils	LS
1, 2, 3, 4	Impact HAZ-5: Potential Safety Hazards in an Airport Zone	NI	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact HAZ-6: Potential Conflict with Emergency Response	S	Mitigation Measure HAZ-3. Prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan	LS

## NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

LS = less than significant	SU = significant and unavoidable	B = Beneficial
PS = potentially significant	NI = no impact	C = Cumulative
S = significant	NA = not applicable	

Table ES-2. Continued

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation <sup>a</sup>	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4	Impact HAZ-7: Potential Risk of Wild Fire	S	Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: Require Spark-Generating Construction Equipment be Equipped with Manufacturers' Recommended Spark Arresters  Mitigation Measure HAZ-5. Clear Materials That Could Serve as Fire Fuel from Areas Slated for Construction Activities Before Construction Begins	LS
<b>TRAFFIC</b>				
2, 4	Impact TRA-1: Degradation of SR 28 Roadway Level of Service (LOS)	S	NA	SU
2, 4	Impact TRA-2: Increase in Average Daily Traffic on Residential Streets in Excess of Applicable Standards	S	NA	SU
1, 2, 3, 4	Impact TRA-3: Degradation of Intersection Levels of Service	S	Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Provide Westbound Right-Turn Lane at SR 28/267 Intersection	SU
2, 4	Impact TRA-4: Bicycle and Pedestrian Conditions along SR 28	B	NA	NA
2, 4	Impact TRA-5: Degradation of Transit Operations	S	NA	SU
2, 3, 4	Impact TRA-6: Degradation of Emergency Access or Response Times	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact TRA-7: Short-Term Construction-Related Changes in Circulation and Local Traffic Patterns	S	Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan during Construction	SU

## NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

LS = less than significant	SU = significant and unavoidable	B = Beneficial
PS = potentially significant	NI = no impact	C = Cumulative
S = significant	NA = not applicable	

Table ES-2. Continued

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation <sup>a</sup>	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
<b>PARKING</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact PK-1: Parking Utilization in Excess of 90%	LS	NA	LS
<b>LAND USE AND PLANNING</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact LU-1: Potential Inconsistency with Existing Land Uses	S	Mitigation Measure LU-1: Implement a Community Involvement and Public Participation Plan  Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan during Construction	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact LU-2: Potential Inconsistency with Local and Regional Plans and Policies	S	Mitigation Measure LU-2: Amend the Kings Beach Community Plan	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact LU-3: Impacts on Parking Availability	LS	NA	LS
<b>NOISE</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact NZ-1: Generation of Construction Noise in Excess of Standards	S	Mitigation Measure NZ-1: Employ Noise-Reduction Construction Measures  Mitigation Measure NZ-2: Prohibit Nighttime Construction Activities  Mitigation Measure NZ-3: Disseminate Essential Information to Residences and Implement a Complaint/Response Tracking Program	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact NZ-2: Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise in Excess of Standards	LS	NA	NA

## NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

LS = less than significant	SU = significant and unavoidable	B = Beneficial
PS = potentially significant	NI = no impact	C = Cumulative
S = significant	NA = not applicable	

Table ES-2. Continued

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation <sup>a</sup>	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
<b>RECREATION</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact REC-1: Increase the Use of Recreational Facilities That Would Cause Physical Deterioration of the Facility	S	Mitigation Measure REC-1: Implement Measures to Minimize Effects to Kings Beach SRA	LS
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact UT-1: Impacts on Utilities	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact UT-2: Impacts on Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, and Emergency Medical Services	S	Mitigation Measure UT-1: Implement Measures to Reduce Potential Impacts on Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, and Emergency Medical Services	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact UT-3: Impacts on Stormwater Drainage Facilities	S	Mitigation Measure UT-2: Develop a Comprehensive Stormwater Drainage Conveyance Plan	LS
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact GEO-1. Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury Caused by Fault Rupture	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact GEO-2. Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury Caused by Ground Shaking	S	Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Incorporate Recommendations from Geotechnical Reports into Project Design	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact GEO-3. Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury as a Result of Development on Materials Subject to Liquefaction	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact GEO-4. Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury as a Result of Landsliding	LS	NA	NA

## NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

LS = less than significant	SU = significant and unavoidable	B = Beneficial
PS = potentially significant	NI = no impact	C = Cumulative
S = significant	NA = not applicable	

Table ES-2. Continued

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation <sup>a</sup>	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4	Impact GEO-5. Temporarily Increase the Potential for Accelerated Runoff, Erosion, and Sedimentation as a Result of Grading and Construction Activities	S	Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Incorporate Recommendations from Geotechnical Reports into Project Design	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact GEO-6. Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury as a Result of Development on Expansive Soils	LS	NA	NA
<b>WATER QUALITY</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact WQ-1. Substantial Alteration in the Quality of Surface Runoff	S	Mitigation Measure WQ-1. Implement Construction BMPs Contained in the SWPPP Mitigation Measure WQ-2. Implement a Spill Prevention and Control Program	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact WQ-2. Substantial Degradation of Water Quality or Violation of any Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact WQ-3. Substantial Alterations of the Existing Drainage Pattern of the Site Area Such That Flood Risk and/or Erosion and Siltation Potential Would Increase	S	Mitigation Measure WQ-1. Implement Construction BMPs Contained in the SWPPP Mitigation Measure WQ-2. Implement a Spill Prevention and Control Program	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact WQ-4. Substantial Reduction in Groundwater Quantity or Quality	LS	NA	NA
<b>GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact GI-1: Induce Substantial Population Growth, Either Directly or Indirectly	LS	NA	NA

## NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

LS = less than significant	SU = significant and unavoidable	B = Beneficial
PS = potentially significant	NI = no impact	C = Cumulative
S = significant	NA = not applicable	

Table ES-2. Continued

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation <sup>a</sup>	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact VIS-1: Temporary Visual Impacts Caused by Construction Activities	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4	Impact VIS-2: Adversely Affect a Scenic Vista	LS	NA	NA
2, 4	Impact VIS-3: Degrade the Existing Visual Character or Quality of the Site and Its Surroundings	S	Mitigation Measure VIS-1: Implement Project Landscaping Plan to Replace Trees that are Removed, Using the Specified Guidelines	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact VIS-4: Create a New Source of Light and Glare that Affects Views in the Area	S	Mitigation Measure VIS-2: Lighting Levels Mitigation Measure VIS-3: Directed Lighting Mitigation Measure VIS-4: Highway Fixtures with Low-Sheen and Non-Reflective Surface Materials	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact VIS-5: Conflict with Policies or Goals Related to Visual Resources	LS	NA	NA
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>				
2, 3, 4	Impact BIO-1: Disturbance of Urban-Altered Jeffery Pine Forest	S	Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Establish Exclusion Zones  Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Seasonal Restrictions on Construction  Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoid the Introduction of New Noxious Weeds  Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Revegetate Disturbed Areas	LS

## NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

LS = less than significant	SU = significant and unavoidable	B = Beneficial
PS = potentially significant	NI = no impact	C = Cumulative
S = significant	NA = not applicable	



Table ES-2. Continued

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation <sup>a</sup>	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4	Impact BIO-2: Loss or Disturbance of Wetlands and Streams	S	Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Establish Exclusion Zones  Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Seasonal Restrictions on Construction  Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoid the Introduction of New Noxious Weeds  Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Revegetate Disturbed Areas	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact BIO-3: Effects on Regional Wildlife Species of Concern	S	Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Seasonal Restrictions on Construction  Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Revegetate Disturbed Areas	LS
2, 3, 4	Impact BIO-4: Spread of Weedy Plant Species	S	Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoid the Introduction of New Noxious Weeds  Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Revegetate Disturbed Areas	LS

## NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

LS = less than significant	SU = significant and unavoidable	B = Beneficial
PS = potentially significant	NI = no impact	C = Cumulative
S = significant	NA = not applicable	

The proposed alternatives have been reviewed within the context of numerous federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, and policies. This DEA/DEIR/DEIS evaluates the environmental consequences with reference to specific agency standards, guidelines, and regulations that serve as evaluation criteria against which the viability of individual alternatives can be assessed. The DEA/DEIR/DEIS provides sufficient information for the TRPA to comply with standards contained in the Tahoe Regional Plan, for Placer County and the Caltrans to comply with standards contained in the CEQA, and for the FHWA to comply with standards pursuant to the NEPA.

Final selection of a preferred alternative will not be made until after the full evaluation of environmental effects.

## **ES.8 Issues Raised by the Public**

Placer County has not identified a preferred alternative at this stage in the project development process. A preferred alternative will be identified in the final EA/EIR/EIS after a review of agency and public comments. It is anticipated that the selection of the build alternative will result in various areas of controversy, depending on the particular alternative selected, including traffic congestion; pedestrian and bicycle mobility; economic impacts; and issues related to parking, transit, traffic diversion, pedestrian crossings, and right-of-way acquisition. In addition, public involvement has indicated that maintaining the character of the commercial core area, environmental issues, universal accessibility, compliance and safety, community connections, adaptability and flexibility to surrounding areas, multiuse opportunities, sightlines and views, diversity and inclusiveness, and longevity and maintenance are important issues to the community that should be considered when designing, choosing, and constructing the project elements.